

## **REMARKS**

### **Interview with the Examiner**

Applicants thank the Examiner for his courtesy in speaking by telephone with Applicants' undersigned representative on September 17, 2009. During the telephone interview, Applicants' representative discussed the following typographical errors in the Office Action:

(1) on page 10, "As to claim 58, claim is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 41" should instead read: "As to claim 59, claim is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 42." This is because claim 42 was rejected on page 5 of the Office Action and claim 41 was indicated as allowable;

(2) on page 12, "Claims 39, 41, 56, 59 are objected to" should instead read: "Claims 39, 41, 56, 58 are objected to;" and

(3) on page 3, claims 1-36 should not be rejected because they were previously canceled. The Examiner confirmed these typographical errors in the Office Action, and therefore Applicants' responses below are based on the corrected information in (1) - (3) above.

### **Claim Amendments**

Applicants have amended claims 37, 38, 40-50, 52-55, 57-67, and 69-72; canceled claims 39 and 56 without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter; and added new claims 73 and 74. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 37, 38, 40-55, and 57-74 remain pending and under current examination.

### **Office Action**

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection and rejection made in the Office Action, wherein the Examiner:

- (a) rejected claims 37, 38, 40, 42-55, 57, 59<sup>1</sup>, and 60-72 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,542,733 B1 ("Dennis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,108 B1 ("Rogers"); and
- (b) objected to claims 39, 41, 56, and 58<sup>2</sup> as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the subject matter of claims 39, 41, 56, and 58<sup>2</sup> is allowable. See Office Action, p. 12. In response, Applicants have incorporated all of the features of allowable claim 39 into independent claim 37, and all of the features of allowable claim 56 into independent claim 54. In addition, Applicants have presented new independent claim 73, which incorporates all of the features of allowable claim 41 and independent claim 37, and presented new independent claim 74, which incorporates all of the features of allowable claim 58<sup>2</sup> and independent claim 54.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 37, 38, 40, 42-55, 57, 59<sup>1</sup>, and 60-72 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dennis in view of Rogers. Without acceding to the Examiner's grounds of rejection, Applicants have amended each of independent claims 37 and 54 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claims 39 and 56, respectively. Therefore, amended independent claims 37 and 54 should be allowable. Dependent claims 38, 40, 42-55, 57, 59<sup>1</sup>, and 60-72 should also be allowable at least by virtue of

---

<sup>1</sup> (Corrected)

<sup>2</sup> (Corrected)

their respective dependence from allowable base claim 37 or 54. New claims 73 and 74 should also be allowable, at least because claim 73 includes the allowable subject matter of claim 41 and claim 37, and claim 74 includes the allowable subject matter of claim 58<sup>2</sup> and claim 54, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection.

**Conclusion**

Applicants request reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the objection and rejection. Pending claims 37-74 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants request a favorable action.

If there are any remaining issues or misunderstandings, Applicants request the Examiner telephone the undersigned representative to discuss them.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 5, 2009

By: 

David M. Longo  
Reg. No. 53,235

/direct telephone: (571) 203-2763/